



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,494	07/16/2003	Duc Thong Lau	085804-015001	9067
76/58 7590 02/22/2010 YAHOO! INC. C/O GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP MET LIFE BUILDING 200 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10166				
EXAMINER				
UBER, NATHAN C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3622				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/22/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/620,494

Applicant(s)

LUU, DUC THONG

Examiner

NATHAN C. UBER

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-12 and 14-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-12 and 14-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the RCE filed on 08 January 2010.
2. Claims 1, 23, 33, 37 and 39 have been amended.
3. Claims 9 and 13 have been previously canceled.
4. Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 14-39 are currently pending and have been examined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

5. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08 January 2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1, 23, 33, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant amended the independent claims to further limit the limitation "total booked amount;" however there is no support in the specification for this amendment. There is no definition of "total booked amount" in the specification and there is no recitation disclosing what

Art Unit: 3622

"total booked amount" comprises. The newly added limitation is considered impermissible new matter.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 14-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner reconsidered this rejection in light of Applicant's response (see page 9 of Applicant's remarks). Applicant's response broadly directing Examiner's attention to ¶¶0016, ¶¶0038-0062 and ¶¶0126-0149 of the specification did not sufficiently indicate where in the specification this indefinite claim language is supported. Examiner found no clear definitions of the following limitations in the cited paragraphs. These rejections are maintained in the present office action with respect to the claim terms listed below. For the purposes of this examination Examiner assumes that Applicant accepts Examiner's interpretation of the indefinite claim language cited in the previous office action and repeated below.

- Line = parameter that distinguishes aspects of an ad campaign such as a demographic or media venue (tv vs. internet)
- Web property = a web site (collection of web pages, see ¶0031 of the specification)
- Booked amount = price

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3622

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
12. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12, 14-16, 18-27 and 29-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Del Sesto (U.S. 6,985,882) in view of Hennessey (U.S. 2003/0050827).

Claims 1, 23, 33, 37 and 39:

Del Sesto, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *specifying a target Gross Rating Point (GRP) for one or more lines of an Internet advertising campaign (see at least Figure 4J, market goal GRP),*
- *specifying a total booked amount for the lines (see at least Figure 4J, total budget),*
- *wherein the total booked amount comprises a total amount reserved for the lines (see at least Figure 4J, total budget; Examiner notes that 'budget' means a sum of money allocated for a particular purpose),*

Although Del Sesto does disclose a display and tracking feature of advertisements over time (see at least figure 4J, "GRP per day part"), Del Sesto does not specifically disclose the apportionment/dividing of the target GRP by time of day as in the limitations below.

However, Hennessey, as shown, does:

- *apportioning, via a computer device, the target GRP among one or more time periods of the Internet advertising campaign (see at least Figure 6, the GRP is divided by day parts),*
- *apportioning, via a computer device, the total booked amount among the time periods (see at least Figure 7, the budget is divided by day parts),*

- *wherein recognized revenue is based on the apportioned target GRP and the apportioned total booked amount* (see at least Figure 11),
- *visibly display[ing] the recognized revenue on a user interface on a display of the computer device* (see at least Figure 7),

The primary difference between Del Sesto and Hennessey is that Del Sesto contemplates a prepaid contract and focuses on tracking advertising actually distributed and making good on the contract eventually, while Hennessey has a more "real-time" focus so that it can use data to more accurately predict advertising revenue and set more competitive advertising prices. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the two features above in the context of an "after-the-fact" invoicing plan because the tracking features of Del Sesto combined with the time display format of Hennessey reflect the actual performance and value of the service provider in distributing the advertisement over the defined period of time enabling the advertiser to pay only for the services received and retain its remaining advertising budget until the service provider later makes good on the contract. Further the combination of the teachings is obvious since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claims 2, 25 and 34:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection above. Although Del Sesto does disclose a display and tracking feature of advertisements over time, Del Sesto does not specifically disclose the apportionment of the target GRP as in the limitation below. However, Hennessey, as shown, does:

- *the target GRP is apportioned equally among the time periods* (see at least Figure 7 and ¶0027).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the two features above in the context of an "after-the-fact" invoicing plan because the tracking features of Del Sesto combined with the time display format of Hennessey reflect the actual performance and value of the service provider in distributing the advertisement over the defined period of time enabling the advertiser to pay only for the services received and retain its remaining advertising budget until the service provider later makes good on the contract.

Claims 3, 26 and 35:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Although Del Sesto does disclose a display and tracking feature of advertisements over time, Del Sesto does not specifically disclose the apportionment of the target GRP as in the limitation below. However, Hennessey, as shown, does:

- *the booked amount is apportioned equally among the time periods* (see at least Figure 7 and ¶0027).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the two features above in the context of an "after-the-fact" invoicing plan because the tracking features of Del Sesto combined with the time display format of Hennessey reflect the actual performance and value of the service provider in distributing the advertisement over the defined period of time enabling the advertiser to pay only for the services received and retain its remaining advertising budget until the service provider later makes good on the contract.

Claims 4, 24, 36 and 38:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *determining an actual GRP achieved for the time periods* (see at least Figure 4J),

- *determining recognized revenue for the time periods such that a ratio of the recognized revenue to the total booked amount is based on a ratio of the actual GRP to the target GRP (see at least Figure 4J).*

Claims 6 and 27:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto, as shown, discloses the following limitation:

- *the ratio of recognized revenue to the total booked amount equals the ratio of the actual GRP to the target GRP for the lines (see at least Figure 4J).*

Claims 7 and 30:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Although Del Sesto does disclose a display and tracking feature of advertisements over time, Del Sesto does not specifically disclose the apportionment of the revenue as in the limitation below. However, Hennessey, as shown, does:

- *the ratio of recognized revenue for a particular time period to the total booked amount for a particular line is equal to the ratio of actual GRP to the target GRP for a particular line (see at least Figure 11).*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the two features above in the context of an "after-the-fact" invoicing plan because the tracking features of Del Sesto combined with the time display format of Hennessey reflect the actual performance and value of the service provider in distributing the advertisement over the defined period of time enabling the advertiser to pay only for the services received and retain its remaining advertising budget until the service provider later makes good on the contract.

Claims 8, 29 and 31:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto does not disclose:

- *determining an invoice amount for a billing period*

- *the invoice amount being calculated by adding recognized revenue for the lines for the time periods falling within the billing period*

However, the Examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is old and well-known in the art to bill advertisers by invoice for services rendered over an established period of time. Furthermore, the Examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is old and well-known that invoice amounts typically represent a sum of the cost of services rendered over the period of time the invoice contemplates.

Ergo, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to total the *recognized revenue* (which Del Sesto does disclose as shown above) within a prescribed period to determine an invoice amount because this is the only means available within the art (referring to the combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey) to value the service of distributing advertisements in terms of dollars and both the service provider and the advertiser are interested in paying and receiving payment for the value of services rendered.

Claims 10 and 32:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto does not disclose the limitation below:

- *adding revenue for a particular time period that falls partially within the billing period based on an amount of time that a particular time period falls within the billing period* (examiner takes official notice that Applicant has described prorating charges for services that may overlap billing cycles, and that such a method is known in the art).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the commonly known capability of prorating invoices to the methods contemplated by Del Sesto/Hennessey shown above because adding this feature enables the advertiser to see the effectiveness of their advertisements not only over conventional time periods (like weeks or months or days or day parts) but also in a completely

customized time period (any arbitrarily defined billing period) which may be beneficial to one or the other for accounting purposes for example.

Claims 11 and 12:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto does not limit time periods to weeks or months, however Del Sesto does contemplate analysis over various time periods, as shown:

- *the time period is a week* (see at least Figure 4L, flight dates),

With regard to the limitation of *wherein the billing period is a month* (Del Sesto does not define billing periods, the examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is old and well-known that a billing period may be a calendar month and in fact a calendar month is a conventional time period to use to define billing cycles. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the weekly analysis capabilities of the Del Sesto invention with monthly billing cycles because monthly billing cycles are very common in the art and are therefore very accommodating for accounting purposes.

Claim 14:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto does not disclose the limitation below:

- *capping the invoice amount for a line to an amount for the line for the billing period,*

Examiner takes official notice that in many service contracts, invoices are capped at a prescribed amount. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to ensure that any invoicing system is capable of working with in such a parameter if necessary.

Claim 15:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto, as shown, discloses the following limitation:

- *when a total actual GRP for a billing period for a particular line differs from a total target GRP for the particular line for the billing period, applying the difference between the total actual GRP and the total target GRP for the billing period to a subsequent billing period (see at least Figure 4J).*

Claim 16:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto, as shown, discloses the following limitation:

- *when the total actual GRP for the billing period for a particular line is less than the total target GRP for the particular line for the billing period, applying the difference between the total actual GRP and the total target GRP to a subsequent billing period (see at least Figure 4J).*

Claim 18:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto discloses the following limitation:

- *each of the lines has an associated target GRP (see at least Figure 4J).*

Claim 19:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto, as shown, discloses the following limitation:

- *any difference between an actual weekly GRP and a target weekly GRP is automatically carried over to the subsequent week, if a subsequent week is within a same calendar month (see at least Figure 4J).*

Claim 20:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto, as shown, discloses the following limitation:

- *the difference is calculated for each of the lines of the Internet advertising campaign (see at least Figure 4J).*

Claim 21:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto, as shown, discloses the following limitation:

- *recognized revenue is separately calculated for each of the lines* (see at least Figure 4J).

Claim 22:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto, as shown, discloses the following limitation:

- *the billing period of each of the lines is independent of other lines* (see at least Figure 4B).

13. Claims 5, 17, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Del Sesto/Hennessey and further in view of Alvarez et al. (U.S. 6,772,129).

Claims 5 and 28:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto does not disclose the following limitation as Del Sesto is focused on media distribution in television and radio formats. However, Alvarez, as shown, does disclose the following limitation:

- *serving advertisements on one or more Web pages in accordance with campaign parameters* (see at least the Abstract, "[t]his method measures all known forms of media... such as internet banners and email...").

The Alvarez invention is focuses only on measuring the effectiveness and efficiency of advertising and as such it contemplates a wider array of media. Among the various variables Alvarez uses to establish the effectiveness of an advertisement, Alvarez also relies on a comparison target GRPs and actual GRPs. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the wider media capabilities of Alvarez with the more robust contract/billing monitoring capabilities of Del Sesto because this combination can bring all of the benefits of the Del Sesto invention to campaigns that span the full range of advertising venues.

Claim 17:

The combination of Del Sesto/Hennessey discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Del Sesto does not disclose the following limitation, however Alvarez, as shown, does:

- *each of the lines is related to an individual Web property* (see at least the Abstract, "[t]his method measures all known forms of media... such as internet banners and email...").

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the wider media capabilities of Alvarez with the more robust contract/billing monitoring capabilities of Del Sesto because this combination can bring all of the benefits of the Del Sesto invention to campaigns that span the full range of advertising venues.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 08 January 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
15. Applicant attempted to demonstrate where in the specification indefinite terminology use dint eh claims is defined. However, Applicant was unsuccessful in this endeavor. With respect to the claim term 'line' Applicant argues that line is defined in paragraphs 16 and 33 of the specification as a 'line in an advertising contract' and even provided quotations to support Applicant's assertion. However Applicant's definition is entirely missing from the specification. The quoted text (which appears in ¶0014 not ¶0016) states that "Each line specifies any one or more of the following criteria: the particular ad; the Web property on which the ad is to appear; start date; end date/duration; pricing (i.e. booked amount of money); GRP; and the like." This is not a definition of 'line.' Nor does this paragraph indicate that a line is a line in an advertising contract as alleged in Applicant's argument. Examiner maintains examiner's 112 indefinite rejection.

Art Unit: 3622

16. Similarly Applicant's arguments with respect to 'web property' and booked amount' are not supported in the specification as argued on pages 9-10 of Applicant's remarks). When the specification indicates that a "web property may be..." something, the specification fails to indicate what a web property "is." Examples are not definitions. With regard to ¶0018, which allegedly supports Applicant's definition of "booked amount" on page 9 of Applicant's remarks, below is a copy of the text from ¶0018 in the original disclosure:

[0018] Thus, the system and method for conducting an advertising campaign as described herein may facilitate booking, revenue recognition, management and billing of a Web advertising campaign. Moreover, the Web advertising campaign is conducted such that the related revenue calculations are consistent, fair and meaningful to client advertisers.

There is absolutely no discussion in this paragraph of the definition of 'booked amount.' Applicant's arguments attempting to overcome the 112 2nd rejection are inadequate. The rejection is maintained.

17. Applicant argues that "[a] budget is an estimate of income and expense" see page 11 of Applicant's remarks. Applicant argues that Applicant's claimed "total booked amount" is distinguishable over the teaching of a budget in Del Sesto because the "total booked amount is the total amount of money that has been booked for one or more lines of an advertising campaign and is not an estimate of income and expense for a given period in the future" (see page 11 of Applicant's remarks). Examiner reiterates, that the limitation "total booked amount" is indefinite in the claims and is not defined in the specification. Further Applicant cannot now add a limiting definition to a claim term by argument, no may Applicant no add a limitation to the claim that was heretofore entirely missing from the original disclosure because such an amendment constitutes new matter. Further Applicant's definition of "budget" is unsupported and as is inconsistent with the common meaning of the word budget known in the art. Budget means "a sum of money allocated for a particular purpose." The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines budget more broadly as "a quantity (as of energy or water) involved in, available for, or assignable to a particular situation." Examiner is not therefore convinced of Applicant's premise that a budget only means "an estimate of income and expense." Rather Examiner interprets 'budget' consistent with the

Art Unit: 3622

definitions commonly known in the art which teach the claimed 'total booked amount' as shown in the rejection above.

18. Examiner has maintained throughout the prosecution of this application that the limitation *booked amount* is indefinite. Applicant continues to maintain this language in the claims and here attempts to rely on Attorney argument and by adding new matter to the claim to assign meaning/definition to this indefinite claim language. The MPEP is clear on this matter:

Attorney argument is not evidence unless it is an admission, in which case, an examiner may use the admission in making a rejection. See MPEP § 2129 and § 2144.03 for a discussion of admissions as prior art. The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. *In re. Schulze*, 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965); *In re. Geisler*, 116 F.3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("An assertion of what seems to follow from common experience is just attorney argument and not the kind of factual evidence that is required to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness."). See MPEP § 716.01(c) for examples of attorney statements which are not evidence and which must be supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration. MPEP 2145(II).

Examiner's in interpretation of the Del Sesto budget is maintained. The budget taught by Del Sesto does not fail to disclose specifying a "total price/booked amount" as claimed.

19. Applicant next repeats previous arguments with respect to perceived deficiencies of Hennessey. Applicant argues that Hennessey's budget is not a 'total booked amount' as claimed (see page 12 of Applicant's remarks). Here Applicant continues to attack the Hennessey reference in a piecewise fashion, instead of in combination, as intended by the Examiner and as shown above in the rejections under 35 USC § 103(a). In response to Applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The cited figure discloses an exemplary budget for 'The Fish Shack Organic Foods' ads divided/apportioned by day part as claimed. Applicant's argument appears to rely on Applicant's insistence that the Examiner is somehow misinterpreting the meaning of "total booked amount," although as noted above with respect to Applicant's arguments against the Del Sesto reference,

Art Unit: 3622

Applicant has repeatedly failed to demonstrate a clear definition for this limitation. In any case, Examiner clearly indicated in the rejection that Del Sesto teaches the "total booked amount" limitation, and Hennessey is only relied on to demonstrate the 'apportioning' limitation. Here Hennessey unambiguously teaches apportioning an advertising budget based on the apportioned GRP as claimed. The combination of references teaches the claimed limitation. Examiner maintains the previous rejection; Applicant's argument is not persuasive.

20. Applicant argues that figure 11 of Hennessey "does not disclose recognized revenue being based on an apportioned target GRP and an apportioned total booked amount" (see page 12 of Applicant's remarks). In fact figure 11 presents a column labeled 'Actual 110% SO CPP' which presents by day-part the actual revenue per gross rating point (see also Hennessey ¶0115, explaining the columns of Figure 1). Applicant looks only to the column labeled '% revenue contribution,' then summarily dismissed the full teaching of the cited figure. Applicant's argument is not persuasive, Examiner maintains the previous rejection.
21. Examiner reminds Applicant that Hennessey was relied upon in the combination with Del Sesto to disclose the "apportionment/division" limitation because Del Sesto discloses the "target GRP" and "total booked amount" limitations. Del Sesto also discloses varying GRP based on time (see Figure 4J, GRP per day part). Hennessey demonstrates that one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have known to (and could have) apportioned/divided the target GRP and booked amount of Del Sesto in the same manner that Hennessey apportioned GRP (figure 6) and an advertising budget (figure 7). Further figure 11 of Hennessey was relied upon to teach "recognized revenue" because figure 11 displays actual revenue figures (calculated with actual GRP) alongside projected/target figures based on projected/target GRP. The "recognized revenue" of the claim is the difference between the actual and the projected. This value is clearly demonstrated by Hennessey in figure 11. Figure 11 and at least ¶0097 demonstrate the "recognized revenue" of the claims; the purpose of this information in the reference is incidental to the teaching. The Hennessey teachings are appropriately relied upon to demonstrate that one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have known to divide target GRP

Art Unit: 3622

and target ad budgets over time as taught by Hennessey. Therefore one practicing the Del Sesto invention could have applied Hennessey's teachings to the Del Sesto invention since the Hennessey elements in the combination would have performed the same function as they did separately and the result of the combination of the elements would have been predictable. Here the combination is merely preparing and displaying the data of Del Sesto in a manner taught by Hennessey.

22. Applicant continues to argue that "[t]he Office Action states that Del Sesto does not disclose [several] claim elements" of the independent claim (see page 10 of Applicant's remarks). This statement is in fact false. This is not the first time Applicant has mischaracterized Examiner's 103 rejections in this regard. The previous Office action clearly asserts that Del Sesto does not specifically disclose the apportioning limitations and therefore Examiner relies on the teachings of Hennessey for the apportioning limitations. The combination of references teaches apportioning GRP. Examiner clearly explained that the combination of references teaches the limitations in the independent claims above, and that Del Sesto does not specifically disclose apportioning, therefore the Hennessey reference is relied on to teach the dependent claims in question. Examiner did not state that Del Sesto does not teach the subject matter of claim 1. Examiner clearly states the opposite.
23. Applicant's arguments stating that the combination of the prior art of record does not fully disclose nor fairly suggest the claimed invention fails to persuade the Examiner because, as shown in the rejections and arguments above, the prior art of record is clearly and unarguably analogous as well as relevant. In addition, Applicant's arguments regarding the teachings of the prior art of record fall short because when combined together, the prior art of record wholly and flawlessly discloses the claimed invention. Applicant's argument's regarding alleged concessions by Examiner are false and fail to persuade Examiner that Examiner's position with respect to the prior art of record is different from that which Examiner has clearly expressed in Examiner's rejections of the claims above. Applicant should carefully consider revising the claim language to

Art Unit: 3622

overcome the pending rejections which may place the application in a better condition for allowance.

Conclusion

24. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Nathan C Uber** whose telephone number is **571.270.3923**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30am-4:00pm EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **Eric Stamber** can be reached at **571.272.6724**.
25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).
26. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

27. Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window**:

Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314.

Art Unit: 3622

/Arthur Duran/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622